

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

TERENCE TERELL BRYAN, ) C.A. No. 4:04-1853-25BH  
                          )  
Plaintiff,              )  
                          )  
vs.                     ) **WRITTEN OPINION AND ORDER**  
                          )  
SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF )  
CORRECTIONS AND JOHN DOE,    )  
                          )  
Defendants.            )  
                          )  
                          )

---

In this *pro se* case, the plaintiff, an inmate of the South Carolina Department of Corrections, alleges that the defendants have wronged him in numerous respects. The defendants deny these allegations.

On December 1, 2004, the plaintiff filed an “Emergency Motion for Injunctive Relief” in which he requests that the Court issue an Order “directing [the] defendants to produce to plaintiff the legal work taken, including but not limited to, case file.” (Docs. # 26). According to the plaintiff, his legal work and/or case file was taken from him by the defendants on October 25, 2004, and he cannot successfully defend any motion for summary judgment. The undersigned notes that the plaintiff has numerous other pending legal actions in this Court. As well, the plaintiff has filed similar motions in both this and several other pending cases. This Court independently evaluates the request for injunctive relief in each separate case.

This matter now comes before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, to whom this case had previously been assigned. In his Report, Magistrate Judge Rogers recommends that the plaintiff’s emergency motion for injunctive relief be deemed moot. (Doc. # 47). As reasoned by the Magistrate Judge:

...it appears that plaintiff’s legal work/case file has been returned to him and this motion should be deemed MOOT.

(Doc. # 47).

No party has filed objections to the Report.

This Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. As noted above, no objections have been filed to the Report. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983).

A *de novo* review of the record indicates that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is **ORDERED** that the plaintiff’s emergency motion for injunctive relief is deemed **MOOT**. (Doc. # 26).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Terry L. Wooten

Terry L. Wooten

United States District Court Judge

June 6, 2005  
Florence, South Carolina